



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.

MALTHUSIANISM, DARWINISM, AND PESSIMISM.

THE doctrine of the perfectibility of the human race was first systematically taught by a school of philosophical radicals toward the close of the last century. It was a natural outgrowth of the extravagant hopes that were created by the earlier stages of the French Revolution. Condorcet, while he was in hiding in order to escape the fate of the Girondists, showed the firmness of a philosopher by writing his "Sketch of the Progress of the Human Mind," in which he predicted the removal of all social and political evils, and the establishment of peace, virtue, and happiness over the whole earth. He was arrested before the work was completed, and escaped the guillotine only by a self-inflicted death. In England, William Godwin published, in 1793, his "Political Justice," in which he advocated the same doctrines that Condorcet had taught, and almost with equal peril to himself; since the Government and the populace at that period, as Dr. Priestley found to his cost, showed little mercy to those who were accused of holding revolutionary opinions. Godwin attributed nearly all the vices and misery with which society is afflicted to bad government and bad laws. Reform these, he said; do away with the institutions of property and marriage, which are based on monopoly and fraud, establish the equality of all men, and all wars and contentions will cease, and the spirit of benevolence, guided by justice, will distribute equitably the bounteous fruits of the earth among all persons according to their several needs.

In 1798, as an answer to Godwin's "Political Justice," the Rev. T. R. Malthus published his "Essay on the Principle of Population, or a View of its Past and Present Effects on Human Happiness." This work had early and great success; it formed the basis on which, in great part, during the first half of the present century, the English science of political economy was constructed. Of

course, it was deeply imbued with pessimist opinions. The author's purpose was to show that the principal evils with which human society is afflicted are ineradicable, having their root in human nature itself, so that they are sure to break out anew, and with increased virulence, after any temporary alleviation. Misery and crime, he argued, are not produced to any considerable extent by laws and institutions of man's device, and certainly are not curable by them. Poverty and want are their chief source, and these are the inevitable results of over-population and the consequent struggle for existence. A blind and insatiable craving urges man to multiply his kind, and the necessary consequence of gratifying this impulse is, that the increase of the population has a constant tendency to outrun the means of subsistence. At present, some restraint is put upon this increase by prudential considerations, since most persons consider the irremediableness of marriage, and fear to create an obstacle to their success in life by burdening themselves with the support of a family. Let us suppose, then, that this restraint is taken away by a removal of all the causes which now render it an act of imprudence for either sex to gratify their natural inclinations. Let us suppose that property is equally distributed ; that marriage is no longer an indissoluble tie ; that wars and contentions have ceased ; that unwholesome occupations and habits of life no longer prevail ; that medical skill and foresight have stamped out all preventable diseases ; that the people no longer congregate in great cities, those nurseries of vice and disease, but are distributed over the face of the country, and are engaged chiefly in healthful agricultural operations ; and that the community, as Plato recommended, undertake the whole care and support of all the children that are born, instead of allowing them to become a particular burden to their parents. Is it not evident that, under such circumstances, population would multiply more rapidly than ever, and that there would soon be, not only a lack of food, with a swift return of all the evils consequent upon poverty and famine, but even a want of standing-room for the multitudes claiming place upon the surface of the earth ?

“ How small, of all that human hearts endure,
That part which kings and laws can cause or cure ! ”

For the law is common to the vegetable and animal kingdoms, the human race included, that the rate of increase, however slow or rapid it may be, must operate in the way of a geometrical ratio. The same causes which double a population of one thousand will

double a population of one thousand millions. For example: a given rate of increase between 1790 and 1800 added only 1,200,000 to the white population of this country; between 1830 and 1840 *the same rate* of increase added 3,600,000. Our population was more than doubled between 1790 and 1820; it was again more than doubled between 1820 and 1850. But the former doubling added less than five millions to our numbers, while the latter one added over ten millions; and the next doubling, in 1880, will have added considerably more than twenty millions. Inevitably then, if the population increase at all, it must increase in the way of a geometrical progression—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, etc.

But the means of subsistence, at best, can not possibly be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio—that is, as the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc. The surface of the earth affords only a limited extent of ground, and this is of various degrees of fertility, large portions of it being hardly cultivable at all. By putting more ground in cultivation and improving the modes of agriculture, it is conceivable that, within twenty-five years, the quantity of food should be doubled. But it is not conceivable that *more* than this should be accomplished; that is, that the second twenty-five years should make a *larger* addition to the existing stock than was obtained during the former period. Hence, under the most favorable supposition that can be made, beginning with an annual product equal to one million bushels of wheat, at the end of the first quarter of a century this might be raised to two millions, at the end of the second quarter to three millions, and at the close of the third period to four millions.

Of course, the population can not actually outrun the supply of food, though it is constantly, as it were, striving to do so and battling for the ground. It is restrained, first, by what Malthus calls the *preventive* check, which consists in the exercise of moral restraint, whereby some persons repress their natural inclinations, and either do not marry at all, or postpone the time of marriage till comparatively late in life. This check keeps down the increase of numbers through diminishing the proportion of births. Where this fails to operate to a sufficient extent, the second, or *positive*, check *must* come into play, by increasing the number of deaths, through insufficient nourishment, overcrowding, disease, and crime. Vainly does private munificence or public liberality seek to remove the proximate causes of these evils. Interference only does harm. Leave the poor alone, then, say the Malthusians, to be chastised by fever,

hunger, and misery into a sense of their obligation to society to refrain from increasing their own numbers. The more numerous the family of the pauper, the less claim he has to relief ; his own suffering and that of his family must be his punishment, for thus only can his neighbors be taught prudence. Sanitary measures are equally inefficient. Check the ravages of the small-pox by vaccination ; then typhus fever, the Asiatic cholera, or a famine must supervene in order to keep down the superfluity of life. Hence McCulloch, a leading economist of this school, talked of "the irretrievable helotism" of the English working-classes, and advised his countrymen, in view of it, "to fold their arms and leave the *dénouement* to time and Providence."

The theory of Malthus at once became popular in England, not only because it refuted the revolutionary doctrines of men like Godwin and the French Jacobins, but because it seemed to relieve the rich from any responsibility for the sufferings of the poor, and from any obligation to contribute to their support. "If my conclusions are adopted," said Malthus in his preface, "we shall be compelled to acknowledge that the poverty and misery which prevail among the lower classes of society are absolutely irremediable." And these conclusions seemed incontrovertible, for they rested upon a basis of mathematical calculation, and were supported by an appeal to the obvious facts, that the poor man is made still poorer by the possession of a large family, and that destitution and suffering are most prevalent in localities where the population is most dense. Consequently, pauperism should be regarded as a crime, and should be stamped out, like the cattle-disease, by harsh legislative measures. These opinions led to the enactment, in 1834, of the New Poor Law, the avowed purpose of which was to prevent what is called "outdoor relief," and to collect the destitute and starving in Union workhouses, where, as in jails, the separation of the sexes, the lowness of the diet, and the general severity of the regimen should be a terror to the evil-doers who had presumed to burden society with their superfluous progeny. If the crime was not literally theirs, it was at any rate their parents' fault, and the sins of the fathers must be visited upon the children in order to deter others from like offenses. "Go to the workhouse, or starve," was henceforth to be the answer to all applicants for parochial relief ; and the reader of Dickens need not be reminded that many of them preferred the latter alternative.

It seems strange that Malthusianism should become an accepted

doctrine not only with the Tories and the landed gentry, but with the Whig *doctrinaires* generally, the wealthy manufacturers, and especially the philosophical radicals of the Benthamite school, whose leaders were the elder and the younger Mill. The "Edinburgh Review" advocated it strenuously. Miss Martineau, of whom, as well as of Jeremy Bentham, it must be confessed that the practice was in strict conformity with the principles, inculcated it in a pathetic love-story, which formed one of her "Illustrations of Political Economy." The Benthamites did not allow any morality of sentiment or delicacy upon this subject to conflict with their principles of thoroughgoing utilitarianism ; for it was openly charged against some of their leaders, about 1830, that they caused placards to be posted in the most crowded districts of the great manufacturing towns, in order to teach the laboring poor the same detestable opinions and practices for disseminating which Besant and Bradlaugh have recently been convicted and punished. John S. Mill was so provoked with the people of the United States for multiplying rapidly that he pointed his censure of our folly with this coarse sneer, directed against the Northern and Middle States : "They have the six points of Chartism, and they have no poverty ; and all that these advantages do for them is, that the life of the whole of one sex is devoted to dollar-hunting, and of the other to breeding dollar-hunters."

But the triumph of Malthusianism lasted only for about half a century, and its decline and fall have been even more rapid than its rise. The tide turned about the time of the famine in Ireland in 1846-'47, and the consequent fearful exodus from that unhappy island, which, in less than ten years, deprived it of full one fourth of its population. In 1845 the number of persons in that country was estimated at 8,295,000, and they were increasing with considerable rapidity. In 1851 the population was only 6,574,278 ; and in 1871 it was less than five and one half millions, being a diminution of nearly thirty-five per cent. The Malthusians themselves were appalled at such a result. For the evil did not stop with the immediate diminution of numbers ; as usual in such cases, it was chiefly those who were in the flower of life, the healthy and the strong, who emigrated, leaving behind them the aged, the feeble, and the diseased. Hence the people at home deteriorated in vitality and working power even in a higher ratio than their decrease in numbers. At the same period there was also a great emigration, though by no means to an equivalent extent, from England, and especially from

Scotland, where the great land-owners had acted on Malthusian principles by depopulating their vast estates, unroofing the cottages over their tenants' heads, and thus compelling them to ship themselves beyond sea. Then came the great trials of the Crimean war and the Indian mutiny, with the attendant difficulty of recruiting the army, so that the country awoke to a knowledge of the sad truth that, in banishing their people, they were drying up the sources of their productive power and their military strength.

These events procured a hearing for the arguments with which Mr. Samuel Laing, the noted traveler and social economist, Mr. W. T. Thornton, the author of "*Over-Population and its Remedy*," Colonel P. Thompson, and others, had already vigorously assailed the doctrine of Malthus. In the pages of this Review also (October, 1847, July and October, 1848), this pessimistic theory of population was impugned on general grounds and with facts drawn from American experience. At present, a mere glance at the considerations drawn from these various sources which afford a decisive refutation of Malthusianism must suffice.

The actual limit to the growth of the population in any country is not the quantity of food which it alone is capable of producing from its own soil, but the quantity which it is able and willing to purchase from other lands. Practically, then, the only limit for it is the number, which the surface of the whole earth is capable of feeding. The world is far from being over-peopled yet, and the amount of food which it can produce is so immensely in excess of the present demand that any deficit in the supply can not reasonably be anticipated for thousands of years to come. Europe alone is able to feed, from its own resources, a population five times as great as its present number, before it will be as thickly peopled and as fully cultivated as Belgium is now; and the additional supplies which it might obtain, if needed, from our own Mississippi Valley, from South America, South Africa, Australia, California, and Mexico, are so vast that they can not be computed. Savage tribes do not multiply at all, but rapidly become extinct as soon as they are brought in contact with civilization; and even half-civilized races, like the Turks, Arabs, Tartars, Hindoos, and Chinese, are either stationary or diminishing in number. Turkey in Europe, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, and Turkistan were probably more populous two thousand years ago than they are now. In every way, therefore, man, not Providence, is in fault. The bounties of nature are practically inexhaustible; but men are too ignorant, indolent, and

self-indulgent, too much the slaves of their lower appetites and passions, to profit by them.

At present, therefore, and for an indefinite period still to come, the only limit to the quantity of sustenance which any nation is able to procure, either by cultivating its own soil or by importation from other countries, is the amount of wealth which it is capable of producing. Hence, civilized nations, let them multiply as fast as they may, do not direct their energies chiefly to the raising of food, but to the acquisition of wealth. And, for the attainment of this end, any increase of their numbers, far from being an obstacle, is a help ; for, if there are more mouths to be fed, there are more hands to feed them with. An increase of the population is *pro tanto* an increase of productive power, and it makes no difference whether the article produced is food or a commodity immediately exchangeable for food. One pair of hands, if allowed fair play, can more than satisfy the demands of one stomach, so that there will always remain a surplus for the gradual accumulation of wealth. Less than one fifth of the people of England now devote themselves directly to agriculture, because the other four fifths find that, in the various pursuits of manufactures and commerce, they can equally well obtain the means of satisfying their hunger, and gradually become rich by having a larger surplus. The increase of their numbers does not compel them to cultivate inferior soils near home, but enables them to purchase grain and beef raised on the fat prairies of Illinois or the fertile plains of southeastern Europe. London taxes all the counties of England for sustenance ; England taxes all the countries of the earth for sustenance. Is there any greater hardship or difficulty in the latter case than in the former one ?

In these modern days, with our improved means of communication by steam and telegraph, extreme poverty is the only possible cause of a famine ; and even this poverty is attributable not to the absolute lack of wealth, but solely to its unequal distribution. It was so in the Irish famine of 1846-'47 and in the Indian famine two years ago. When the suffering was at its height, ship-loads of corn and meal were turned away from the Irish ports, and of rice from Madras and Calcutta, solely from the want of a market. In either case, also, great wealth was near at hand ; but it belonged exclusively to the few, and was accessible by the many only in the hard form of charity. The fate both of the Irish and the Hindoos was the more terrible because they starved in the midst of plenty.

On examining the facts in the case more closely, it will always be found that it is not the excess of population which causes the misery, but the misery which causes the excess of population. Hopeless poverty makes men imprudent and reckless, and leads them to burden themselves with a family because they can not be worse off, and there is no possibility of improving their condition. In Switzerland, where the land is parceled out among small proprietors, the peasantry obtain a comfortable livelihood, and therefore increase so slowly that the population will not double itself in less than two hundred and twenty-seven years. In France, where also the land is cut up into very small estates, and the peasantry are vastly better off than in England, the rate of increase for the population for ten years is only five per cent. In England, for the same period, it was fifteen per cent. ; and in Connaught, the sink of Irish misery and degradation, between 1821 and 1831, it was as high as twenty-two per cent. In Galway and Mayo, notoriously two of the most destitute counties, during the same period, there was an increase in the one case of twenty-seven and in the other of twenty-five per cent.—nearly as great as in the United States. Thus the two extremes of general misery and general well-being produce very nearly the same effect on the movement of the population.

In all old countries, which have long since outgrown what may be called the colonial period, during which, as in Australia and the western portion of the United States, the abundance and cheapness of new land waiting to be taken into cultivation tempt most of the people to engage in agriculture—in all old countries, I say, that is, throughout Europe and the most populous parts of Asia, the true law determining the increase of the population is the very opposite of that which the Malthusians sought to establish. They would have us believe that, in proportion as people are well off and have abundance of food, they multiply all the faster ; while the poorer classes, kept down by the *positive* check—that is, by the privations, famines, and diseases generated by over-population—do not multiply at all. But the facts prove beyond all question that the increase of any class of the people is in inverse proportion to its wealth and social rank—that is, to the amount of sustenance which it can easily command. Universally the law is, that the numbers of the poor increase most rapidly, of the middle classes more slowly, and of the upper or wealthier ones either not at all, or so slowly as hardly to be perceptible. “By a singular anomaly,” says Ali-

son, a well-informed English writer upon the subject, "the rapidity of increase is in the inverse ratio of the means which are afforded of maintaining a family in comfort and independence. It is greatest when these means are least, and least when they are the greatest."

Thus, in Sweden, the official returns from the census and the registration of births, deaths, and marriages show that the rate of increase for the peasantry is nearly six times greater than that of the middle class, and over fourteen times greater than that of the nobles. In England it is a matter of common observation that the families of the nobility and landed gentry constantly tend to die out, and, if they were not recruited by promotions from the middle classes, the upper orders of society would gradually disappear. Of the barons who sat in the English House of Lords in 1854, the peerage of considerably more than one half does not date back beyond 1800; and not more than thirty of them can boast that their ancestors were ennobled before 1711. The continued and increasing opulence of the landed gentry of England is chiefly attributable to this cause; since the diminution of their numbers tends, of course, to the concentration of their estates. Celibate or childless lives are common among the younger sons of the nobility and gentry, while they are very infrequent in the classes of artisans and laborers. Even here, in the eastern part of the United States, the sons in educated and wealthy families marry later in life, and have fewer children, than those in the classes who live by handiwork; while the Irish laborers are the most prolific of all. No further back than the beginning of this century, families containing from ten to fifteen children each were not infrequent here in New England; now, one that has more than six is seldom found except among the very poor.

Since 1850, therefore, English writers upon political economy have generally ceased to advocate Malthusianism and its subsidiary doctrines. Many, like Doubleday and Macdonell, besides those already mentioned, renounce it altogether; others pass over it in silence, or, like Fawcett, lend it only a half-hearted support. Even J. S. Mill, who inculcated it like a fanatic in his great work published in 1847, seems to have changed his opinions entirely before his death. In his discussions with Mr. Thornton, he gave up "the wage-fund" doctrine, one of the principal corollaries from Malthusianism; and in his posthumous papers upon Socialism, published in the "Fortnightly Review" during the present year, he expressly teaches that misery causes an increase of the population, instead of

the converse proposition, that over-population produces the misery, which is the essence of the Malthusian theory.

Singularly enough, in 1860, at the very time when this gloomy doctrine of "a battle for life" had nearly died out in political economy, most of the authorities upon the subject having quietly abandoned it as an indefensible speculation, it was revived in biology, and made the basis in that science of a theory still more comprehensive and appalling than that which had been founded upon it by Malthus. Among the countless forms of vegetable and animal life which are developed through the heritability of casual variations from the ancestral type, "a struggle for existence" is constantly going on; and it is a necessary consequence of this struggle that the fittest forms—that is, those whose organs are best adapted to their surroundings—should survive, and that the others, the comparatively unfit, should perish. "The struggle for existence among all organic beings throughout the world," says Mr. Darwin, "inevitably follows from their high geometrical powers of increase"; and he adds, "This is the doctrine of Malthus applied to the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms." Hence, every improvement, however slight, in the adaptation of any species to its environment tends inevitably and mechanically, as it were, to make that species a victor in the battle with all its competitors not possessing such improvement. The accumulation of these improvements upon each other to an unlimited extent fully accounts for the marvelous adaptations of means to ends in organic life which were formerly supposed to have been contrived and brought about by a designing mind. Every one admits that such adaptations exist; Darwinism denies that they are purposed and intended adaptations. And this denial is based upon the Malthusian theory of over-population, and must stand or fall with that theory.

Then we have only to recur to the facts which have disproved Malthusianism as a principle in political economy in order to find in them also a complete refutation of Darwinism. In the struggle for existence between the different classes of human beings, it is the lower classes which survive, because they are more prolific than those above them; while the upper classes, just in proportion to the degree of their elevation, either increase very slowly, or tend to die out altogether. And this victory of the lower classes in the battle for life is a survival, not of the fittest, but of the unfittest, so that it constantly tends to a deterioration of the race instead of contributing to its improvement. Of course, the upper classes enter

into the contest seemingly with all the advantages on their side. According to Darwinism, the odds are altogether in their favor: for they have more developed, because better educated, intellects; they are free from the many peculiar temptations to vice and crime, and the countless liabilities to disease, which beset the poorer classes. On account of their wealth, they have nothing to dread from a famine, and very little from a pestilence, since by removal they can generally get out of its range. They are not early broken down by excessive toil; they are not crowded together in unhealthy habitations; they are protected against the extremes of heat and cold; they have abundant opportunities, by which they profit more or less, for healthful exercise in the open air. Hence they have sound constitutions and transmit sound constitutions to their children, being aided thereto, also, by a wider range of sexual selection in marriage. On account of all these favorable circumstances, the death-rate among them is very low—much lower than among those who are far beneath them in the social scale.

But all these advantages, and the improved organization which is founded upon them, if considered as means and helps toward a victory of the upper classes in the battle for life, are as nothing when compared with the one signal disadvantage under which these classes labor, that the birth-rate among them, through their own fault, is very low, so that they increase slowly, or not at all. Nature is just: those who seem to be her pets are, for the very reason that they are more pampered than the others, in greater peril of extinction. Among the combatants in the great struggle, those who triumph are almost always the more prolific, and those who are satisfied with food which, though coarser, is more abundant and accessible. Those who are rich and are high in the social scale are too dainty in their appetites. They prize too highly the luxuries, the social advantages, on which they have been fed. They will not imperil their position by contracting a hasty or otherwise imprudent marriage, or by cumbering themselves with an inconveniently large family. In countries where the distinctions of rank are so strongly defined and deeply rooted as to appear insurmountable, many are contented to lead lives of licentious celibacy, because they dread social more than moral death. And everywhere, the men of affluence and culture, the highly born and highly bred—the Brahmins of society, as Dr. Holmes calls them—prize the refinements of life, and the gratification of their social and artistic tastes, more than the homely comforts and enjoyments which any one may have

who can induce some good-natured woman to share them with him. Of course, their society soon becomes very select through becoming exceedingly small. "Old families," as they are called, have a trick of rapidly dying out, as if to make room for a race of pretenders and *parvenus*. The Faubourg St.-Germain is not the only place in the world which is tenanted by the ghosts of a departed aristocracy. It is quite unnecessary to cite statistics in order to corroborate these statements. Any one may convince himself of the truth of them who will look round among the families of his acquaintance, ascertain how many they consist of, and compare them with the families of the artisans and laborers in the next street. The poor have a much narrower range of enjoyments open to them than the rich ; the comforts of domestic life are about the only ones that are easily accessible to the lowly ; and who can wonder that these are early sought and highly prized ?

This law respecting the relative increase of the several classes of the population is confirmed by the very fact, already mentioned, which seems at first to point to a different conclusion. When a new country is colonized, the indigenous barbarous tribes waste away before the advancing wave of civilization like snow under a July sun ; and this is certainly a victory of the superior race over the inferior. But here, again, the issue is determined in the main by the comparative fecundity of the competitors, and is but little affected by the other advantages of organization on either side. The individual savage, as a general rule, has greater tenacity of life than his civilized rival ; his wants are fewer, he is satisfied with little and poor food, he can withstand greater hardships ; he can live in a desert where the white colonist would starve. But no matter ; he is less prolific, and therefore invariably goes down in the struggle. Even before they are invaded by a civilized race, barbarous tribes produce so few children who come to maturity, and are so wasted by petty wars and disease, that it is doubtful whether, in the long run, they ever increase in number. The North American Indians whom our forefathers found here on their first arrival were certainly inferior, both in numbers and in the mechanic arts, to the races which had preceded them. Witness the structures reared by the mound-builders, and the implements found in them. The colonists, on the other hand, are drafted chiefly from the working-classes, who are the more prolific even before they leave their old home ; and, in their new one, the cheapness of land and food, together with the scarcity of labor, causes them to multiply like rabbits. There is

something almost marvelous in the rapid growth of the population in the early times in New England. Farmers, fishermen, and clergymen not infrequently seemed to vie with each other in the increasing size of their families. What wonder that the already dwindling tribes of the savages melted away before them !

When we extend our survey beyond the human race, we find the same law hold good for the whole animal and vegetable kingdoms, that the relative increase of numbers is mainly determined by the comparative fecundity of the species, irrespective of slight differences of external organization. The causes of success in the battle for life seem to be physiological rather than morphological. Whether a given plant or animal shall be more or less prolific seems to depend in main part upon physiological processes internal to its constitution, and hardly at all upon the adaptation of its external organs to its environment. Hence, as its chance of survivorship is not increased by any morphological improvement which may happen to be induced upon it by casual variations, that improvement is useless in the struggle and must soon disappear.

Always the lower forms, which are more prolific, tend to be perpetuated at the expense of the higher ones, which are comparatively sterile. Hence, the most remarkable cases of fecundity are found very low down in the scale—among the insects, for instance, and among the fishes, rather than the mammals. Thus it is that some of the lowest genera of vegetable and animal life have come down to us almost unchanged from the earlier geologic ages ; while a multitude of higher types, far more recent in their introduction, have already died out.

This conclusion will appear still more probable in view of a fact which Mr. Darwin himself, with his usual admirable candor in setting forth all the circumstances which make against his theory, as well as those which tend to corroborate it, mentions, that in proportion as a species varies from its original type, it tends to become sterile. The cultivated races which have been much changed by domestication seem to be cursed with barrenness. "Sterility has been said to be the bane of our horticulture" ; and Mr. Darwin adds that, on his view, "we owe variability to the same cause which produces sterility ; and variability is the source of all the choicest productions of the garden."

An experienced breeder of domestic animals, who wrote in 1849, eleven years before Darwinism was invented, gives an amusing account of his endeavors to improve the breed of pigs. Beginning

with a poor brute of the native stock, a typical specimen of all that a well-bred pig ought not to be or to do, except that it regularly produced twice a year a litter of sixteen, eighteen, or even twenty little grunTERS—"reduplications of mamma"—he endeavored, by a process of judicious selection and crossing, to develop a fatter and handsomer type. And he succeeded; after not many years, the aristocratic tenants of his sties became miracles of fatness and models of symmetry. But alas! when one attempts to improve upon nature's handiwork, "things will somehow go a-glee," as the Scotch say. Now that his pigs were promoted into the upper classes of society, they seemed, like other aristocrats, to think that they had nothing to do but to eat, drink, and grunt; they waxed fat and kicked against the old command to increase and multiply. The litters dwindled to six, four, and at length to one; "and we are inclined to think that our experience was a sort of epitome of high breeding." For he declares that the same law holds good in respect to artificial breeds of cattle; the marvelously "improved shorthorns" show an unmistakable tendency to become sterile and to revert into the mongrels that were the elements out of which they were concocted.

So far, then, as either the various species of vegetable or animal life, or the different classes of human society, come into competition with each other at all, the balance of their respective numbers seems to be determined by the counteraction of two opposing forces, namely, by their relative fecundity and by any peculiarities of their organization and situation which enable them to contend successfully against superior numbers. Chief among these peculiarities is the comparatively abundant supply of their appropriate food; slight morphological differences of organization either do not come into play at all, or exert little influence on the result of the contest. Since each of these forces operates as a check on the other, there is no tendency to an extreme result in either direction; neither of the competing races is pressed to utter extinction, or is capable of multiplying beyond a definite limit. Take the family of pachyderms, for instance. On Darwinian principles, the elephant must be considered as a highly developed species of pig, and therefore as having competed in a struggle for existence with its ancestral type during the immense interval of time which must have elapsed while the development was proceeding. But even now, when the superiority of organization is greater than ever, what chance has the higher animal, which produces only about six young in a century,

of crowding out of existence the lower type, which multiplies from ten to twenty fold in the course of a single year? Or, on the other hand, what likelihood is there that prolific piggy will eat up all the food, and thus finally starve out his gigantic antagonist, whose size and strength enable him easily to defend his own feeding-grounds and watering-places against all intruders? Go back, then, to the supposed beginning of the contest, and ask what advantage in it would be acquired by a particular class of pigs through the very gradual elongation of their snouts, say, at the rate of half an inch in a century; or how the long noses could have been perpetuated, on Darwinian principles, if they continued to be useless till they had nearly attained the length and flexibility of an elephant's trunk.

A similar instance may be taken from the order of the quadrumana. The anthropoid apes are assumed to be highly developed species of monkeys, but they certainly seem to have gained no advantage in the battle for life over their lower competitors through their superior organization, but rather to have lost ground in the struggle, since they are relatively so inferior in numbers that they appear to be in some danger of extinction. Through being more prolific, less dainty in feeding, and abler to support changes of climate and other altered conditions of life, the monkeys evidently have the better chance of survival. But the higher apes certainly will not be crowded out of life merely by the greater numbers of those below them, since they are abundantly able to protect themselves against such encroachment. Here, again, the balance of opposing tendencies seems to keep the relative numbers in the competing species within definite limits, without permitting the complete triumph of either party. In many cases the existence and the greater fecundity of the inferior races is a condition of the survival of those above them, who are thus supplied with their necessary food. Thus the carnivora of Central Africa are more developed and more tenacious of life than the herbivorous animals on which they prey; the latter are thus prevented from multiplying unduly, though their entire extinction, of course, would be fatal even to their antagonists. In all these cases, and an indefinite number of others that might be cited, slight morphological differences, induced and perpetuated in the manner supposed by Mr. Darwin, would evidently be of no account whatever in determining the issue of the contest.

Malthusianism, then, is as completely disproved in biology as it previously had been in political economy; and with it disappears

all that is peculiar to Darwinism. There is no such struggle for existence as is supposed to be induced by the tendency of every species to an undue multiplication of its numbers. No one species or form of life has any more reason to dread being killed out in such a contest than we human beings have to fear being starved through the over-population of the earth. And, even if a battle of this sort were possible, victory in it would not depend on superiority of organization. The existence not of the lower races, but of the higher ones, would be imperiled. We can foresee this result in our own case, whether we compare the different classes of human society with each other, or man himself, the order primates, with the inferior animals. In the grand "struggle," which will occur about the time of the Greek Kalends, the primitive stocks, such as Irish bog-trotters and Welsh peasants, would certainly "survive" the nobility and gentry, though the latter profit by the accumulated advantages of high breeding transmitted by direct inheritance through a pedigree extending back to William the Conqueror. And, in the final stage of the conflict, even these original poor representatives of humanity must die out long before some of the animals far below them. Those pests of our summer, the insect tribes, would sing the requiem of man, and feast on his remains. Accordingly, the only original and distinctive feature of Darwinism—its attempt to explain away the argument from design for the being of a God by showing that the supposed adaptations of means to ends, and the admirably complex arrangements by which every portion of a living organism is fitted to do its proper work, may all be accounted for by the blind and unconscious action of mechanical principles and physical laws, without calling in anywhere a Divine purpose or a contriving Mind—must be regarded as a baseless hypothesis. A careful study of the successive development of the higher forms of life upon the earth does not invalidate, but fully confirms, the doctrine which has been held by every great thinker, from Socrates down to the present day, that no organism could have been produced without an organizing mind.

The doctrine of the ascending successive development of the higher forms of life from the types immediately below them, each improved species first appearing in a germ transmitted from unimproved parents, far from constituting a portion of Darwinism properly so called, has been for centuries a favorite speculation, an accepted theory, taught by some of the greatest thinkers in theology and philosophy that the world has ever known. It is merely the

doctrine of derivative creation, or, in other words, of creation in the germ, to be subsequently developed after a longer or shorter interval. St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Malebranche inculcated this theory without offense to the Church ; it was elaborately worked out and defended by Leibnitz as an essential part of his system of monadology ; and Charles Bonnet, a follower of Leibnitz, built upon this foundation his ingenious hypothesis of the *emboîtement* of germs. Certainly, as Christian theists, holding fast our belief not only that every new species, but that each individual living organism, originated in a special act of creation, we have no quarrel with the doctrine of the successive evolution from ancestral germs of higher and higher forms of life and mind. The record of such evolution is only the story of God's providence and incessant creative action throughout the long roll of the geologic ages of this earth, and extending back, perhaps, to the successive generation of new planetary and stellar systems out of primitive chaos. Who shall tell us either when God's creation began or when it was finished? The sole innovation of Darwinism upon this doctrine of evolution consisted in attempting to strip from it all proof of the incessant creative action of a designing mind, by reducing it to a blind mechanical process, necessarily resulting from inherent mud-born energies and productive power. And this attempt, resting solely upon the two unfounded assumptions of a battle for life and of the necessary survival of the higher organisms over the lower ones in that contest, it has now been shown, must be regarded as an ignominious failure. Yet the very making of this attempt contributed much to the speedy and joyful acceptance of the Darwinian hypothesis in certain quarters. It was the pepper which made the dish palatable to Huxley, Haeckel & Co.—that is, to those English and German naturalists whose previous bias in favor of materialism and fatalism indisposed them to recognize anywhere any proofs of the being of a God.

But we have not yet witnessed the last or the worst consequences of the Malthusian theory of over-population. After inducing economical science to regard with hard-hearted indifference the misery of the poor, and to teach positive cruelty as the only means of diminishing the amount of their suffering, and after instructing biology to deny the validity of the principal argument for the being of a God, we have still to consider the results of the adoption of this ill-omened hypothesis into what may well be called the philosophy of despair. The atheists of Germany, where alone the infidel

doctrine is openly avowed and systematically taught in all its appalling consequences, have at last convinced themselves that atheism leads by necessary inference to pessimism. In their own sad experience and their reasoned reflections upon life, they have been compelled to acknowledge the fidelity of the picture which Jean Paul Richter presented only as an appalling "dream"—that of a world without a God. A miserable world they find it to be, destitute alike of happiness, dignity, or hope; and they passionately declare that man's life in it is merely a confused noise between two silences, and is not only not worth living, but is an intolerable burden, so that the sooner it can be shaken off the better. An orphan universe, dust-born, generated and controlled only by the pitiless action of blind mechanical forces, allowing no sense of responsibility and no sanction for morality, void of any belief in the fatherhood of God or in the brotherhood of man, is a source only of misery and despair, and the best course for the conscious beings now doomed to inhabit it is to lead it to speedy painless extinction. It is overpeopled so far as it is peopled at all. Apply "the preventive check" of Malthus, therefore, in its full extent and with the utmost rigor. Let man cease to propagate his kind. We have no right to inflict the misery of existence upon a future generation, who have not been asked whether they were willing to endure the burden, and who, as they are not yet in being, certainly can not suffer wrong in not being called into existence, even if they should be foolish enough hereafter to regard their life as a blessing rather than a curse. The suicide of individuals is faintly condemned, not on the ground of its being in itself an immoral act, but because it would be partial and limited in its consequences, not accomplishing soon enough, if at all, the great purpose of bringing the whole world to an end through an act of cosmic suicide. It would be awkward, it is true, openly to counsel self-murder, since those who gave such advice might be called upon to act consistently with their principles; and they confess the difficulty of ridding themselves altogether of a hankering after life and a fear to go down into the dark. Better allow the human race to die out quietly, as it would do were there no more births. Schopenhauer does not take so lenient a view of the case, for he coarsely says, "The truth is, men ought to be miserable, and they are so"; for they have committed the unpardonable crime of being born.

These are not merely the morbid fancies of a few misanthropes and eccentric thinkers, intent only upon startling the world with

their paradoxes. If they were so, it would be idle to call attention to them here, and to give them the notoriety which they covet. An isolated poet here or there, like Byron or Leopardi, can do little harm with his pessimistic imaginings ; as in Dante's case, we can pardon some bad philosophy for much good poetry ; and we listen with only a silent protest to the ringing lines of the noble Englishman, not fearing that any one will be made a convert by them :

"Count o'er the joys thine hours have seen,
Count o'er thy days from anguish free,
And know, whatever thou hast been,
'Tis something better not to be."

But these German atheists and pessimists have multiplied till they have become a sect formidable alike from their numbers, their ability, the fanatical zeal and persistency with which they preach their doctrines, and the extent to which they are already influencing opinion and conduct, not only in their own land, but in neighboring countries. The popularity of their writings indicates a peril with which civilization itself is menaced, through the corruption and recklessness of those who should be its safeguards—the upper classes of society. Of course their theory is not directly upheld or advocated in any seminary of learning which is under the immediate control of the government, but is zealously controverted, I believe, by all the official teachers of philosophy. Outside of the universities, however, it has become as prevalent and as popular as Hegelianism was forty years ago. It has emboldened the anarchists, and made the men who are avowedly endeavoring to subvert all the institutions of society more daring and reckless than ever. The most dangerous of all heresies is that which inculcates a contemptuous disregard of human life, since he who does not value his own safety will be most prompt and fearless in attacking the safety of others. Society can protect itself against the secret assassin, who has still some fear left of the scaffold and the axe as the punishment of his crime. Neither has it much reason to fear homicidal insanity, since madmen can not act in concert with each other, and an individual is easily overpowered and disarmed. But educated men, who have come to regard their own lives as only a burden to them, though they have been driven to despair, not by the privations and miseries which afflict the hopelessly poor, but by an insensate theory which teaches them to consider the existence of the human race itself as an intolerable evil, that can be abated most effectually by

reducing society to anarchy and ruin, and who have prepared themselves for the admission of this theory by getting rid of all the restraints of morality and religion—these are foes truly formidable, against whom all the precautions and means of defense which governments can institute seem to be of little avail. This is the real ground of the terror recently inspired by the Nihilists in Russia and by the leaders of what is called “the social democracy” in Germany. These men have made themselves *hostes humani generis*. In the former case, the numerous adherents of the sect appear to be drawn exclusively from the upper classes of society, the populace being not only not with them, but against them, since the lower ranks believe both in religion and the Czar. In Germany, where infidel opinions have filtrated lower down through the strata of society, the laboring class have joined to some extent in the movement; but the leadership of the party, both in theory and action, seems to be entirely in the hands of reckless educated men. These are the persons who recently attempted to assassinate both the Emperor William and the Czar, and it is against them that the energetic proceedings of the Government in both cases have been directed. In each instance, the assassin seems to have attempted murder chiefly as a means of committing suicide, but with some hope also, through the turmoil and possible anarchy thus produced, to have accomplished something toward bringing the universe itself nearer to its termination.

This lamentable state of things in respect to the opinions and the conduct of those who should be the better classes of society is not without a parallel at an earlier stage of the world's history. We find a near approximation to it, if not its perfect counterpart, in the character and behavior of the Roman patriciate under the empire; and a striking portraiture of its leading features might be drawn from the gloomy writings of Tacitus, Juvenal, and Suetonius. Most of the emperors were bad enough, but they were no worse than the classes whence the emperors were drawn, the patricians, the senators, and the high officers of the army and the administration. The old polytheistic religion had died out with these men, and a new system of faith had not yet found access to their minds. They had ceased to believe in anything except a debased form of Epicureanism and the fatalism of the Stoics, which pointed directly to suicide whenever the means of sensual pleasure were exhausted. They were not cowardly or feeble in character, or uninstructed; they had all the refinement and culture which belonged to their age, possess-

ing either immediately or by direct inheritance the brilliant accomplishments, the learning, literature, and art of the Augustan period. They were not void of ambition and energy, since the only things which in their eyes still gave any zest to life were wealth, pomp, and power. They played for high stakes in any desperate project for amassing these prizes ; and if the game turned against them, and a brief intimation of the Emperor's will arrived, they assembled their friends for a final joyous banquet, and then cheerfully swallowed poison or opened their veins in a bath. Life's poor play was over, and they deemed themselves well rid of it. As they were men of utterly profligate lives, and there was almost a general license of divorce, they had no family attachments ; either they did not marry at all, or they took good care not to cumber themselves with children. Juvenal indignantly reproaches them for the means employed to this end .

"Sed jacet aurato vix ulla puerpera lecto,
Tantum artes hujus, tantum medicamina possunt."

For those who had great wealth, the surest mode of increasing their power and influence was to remain childless, and hold out hopes to legacy-hunters and those who sought to become their adopted heirs ; thus they surrounded themselves with a stronger crew of adherents and dependents. Even the emperors, most of whom were childless, endeavored in this way to fortify their hold upon power ; and the adopted Cæsar, by taking immediately an active share in the government, was allowed to taste by anticipation the joys of being the absolute master of the civilized world. The wiser heads among them, Augustus and Trajan, saw the extent of the evil ; they perceived that the interests of civilization were at stake, and that the state was in peril through the rapid dying out of the very classes which should have been its ornament and defense. They endeavored to apply a remedy, by multiplying laws in favor of marriage, and offering bounties and privileges to the heads of families containing children. The *jus trium liberorum*, by which the parent having at least three children was freed from all personal charges, was but one of a large number of enactments having the same end in view. But the plague had spread too far and struck too deep to be arrested by any process of legislation. The upper classes of society continued to dwindle away and vanish from the stage, as if not only their morals and their civilization, but their very blood, had become corrupt ; and Rome at last fell because there were no longer any proper Romans left to defend her against barbarian inroads.

German pessimism as a system of philosophy is of very recent origin, though it has been rapidly developed into a complete theory of metaphysics, æsthetics, and ethics, and is already practically applied as a body of principles to the regulation of the thoughts and the conduct of man. It is not older than Schopenhauer's principal work, "*The World as Will and Presentation*," which was nominally published in 1818, though it hardly became known or exerted any appreciable influence before about 1850. Since that date the discussion of the subject has been active, and the doctrine has rapidly gained ground, its adherents constituting a numerous and zealous sect, so that the literature devoted to it is already of considerable dimensions. Besides Edward von Hartmann, who in learning and ability has certainly the chief place among them, and in popularity and influence is not second to any of his philosophical contemporaries, a host of others have published works of more or less note in exposition and defense of the system. Among them may be mentioned Frauenstädt, Bahnsen, Taubert, Mainländer, Venetianer, and Du Prel. The two works bearing immediately upon that portion of the subject with which we are here specially concerned are, first, Philip Mainländer's "*Philosophy of Redemption*," a thick octavo, written with much literary skill and a fervid eloquence, which was published at Berlin in 1876, and, secondly, Von Hartmann's "*Phenomenology of the Moral Consciousness*," a very elaborate work, which first appeared in the same city only at the beginning of the present year. Each of these books particularly considers the duty and the means of effecting what they call "*the salvation of the world*"—that is, of redeeming the universe from the burden of its miserable existence.

There is a wide difference of opinion among the doctors of pessimism in respect to the course of action to be pursued and the conduct which is to be enjoined upon their disciples. While they are all agreed as to the end in view, as to the expediency and the duty of bringing the world to an end as soon as possible, they differ in respect to the means to be employed, and the practicability of effecting their purpose at an earlier or a later day. None of them directly and openly counsel suicide, as it would be inconvenient for them to be called upon to "*reck their own rede*," and as the advice at best would be followed only by the proselytes of the sect. As yet, these are to be found only among the educated classes in Russia and Germany, and their disappearance from the stage would stop the dissemination of their principles, while the rest of mankind

would then multiply all the faster. Only Schopenhauer, whose suspicious and gloomy temperament made him familiar with the darkest possible aspects of life, indirectly favors self-murder, by advising men no longer to have any volitions whatsoever, and thereby, through mere passivity and inanition, to fall back into the comparatively happy realm of nothingness whence they came. Hartmann justly objects that this amounts to a recommendation of the most painful form of death, by voluntary starvation, and would merely induce those who as yet are not converted to pessimism to increase in number more rapidly than ever, in order to fill the opening thus created. The disappearance of the enlightened few would thus tend to a permanent deterioration of the race, though not to its annihilation, nor to a permanent diminution of its numbers ; since the indolent, the reckless, and the base would soon occupy the ground which better men had foolishly abandoned.

The bitter spirit in which Mainländer writes is well indicated in a quotation which he makes from the posthumous memoirs of Alexander von Humboldt. "I was not born," says Humboldt, "in order to be the father of a family. Moreover, I regard marriage as a sin, and the propagation of children as a crime. It is my conviction also that he is a fool, and still more a sinner, who takes upon himself the yoke of marriage—a fool, because he thereby throws away his freedom, without gaining a corresponding recompense ; a sinner, because he gives life to children, without being able to give them the certainty of happiness. I despise humanity in all its strata ; I foresee that our posterity will be far more unhappy than we are ; and should not I be a sinner, if, in spite of this insight, I should take care to leave a posterity of unhappy beings behind me ? The whole of life is the greatest insanity. And if for eighty years one strives and inquires, still one is obliged finally to confess that he has striven for nothing and has found out nothing. Did we at least only know why we are in this world ! But to the thinker, everything is and remains a riddle ; and the greatest good luck is that of being born a flathead."

And to arrive at this conviction, we should add, is the natural consequence, even for the largest intellect, of having lived for eighty years in the world without any belief in the being of a God, and without any nobler purpose than that of self-aggrandizement. What Mainländer immediately adds to this extract, though intended as a eulogy, is in truth a bitter satire upon Humboldt's words and his conduct : "'Did we at least only know why we are in this world !'

Then in the whole rich life of this highly endowed man, there was nothing, absolutely nothing, which he could have apprehended as the ultimate end and aim of life. Not the joy of creating ; not the priceless steps of genius advancing in knowledge ; absolutely nothing."

Very true ! Without any consciousness of a higher purpose as our being's end and aim than the mere gratification of curiosity, though this be dignified with the sounding name of "the advancement of knowledge," life would be destitute of either dignity, grace, or importance. It would not be worth living.

In fact, this quotation from Humboldt contains the gist of Mainländer's whole Philosophy of Salvation. He has but one lesson to teach, and but one duty to inculcate : it is that of celibacy and perfect chastity. In his preface, he boasts that he has not allowed atheism any longer, like religion, to rest upon a foundation of faith, but that its truth has been by him for the first time scientifically demonstrated. In his view of coming death, therefore, the wise man will no longer be troubled by any apprehension of a hereafter. Undisturbed by the thought either of a heaven or a hell, he will welcome the death-stroke as his introduction to a haven of rest, as the end of a life which has been only a prolongation of turmoil, labor, suffering, and anxiety. Nothing could sadden his last moments of consciousness, except the reflection that he was to live again in his children ; that, in order to procure for himself a brief enjoyment, he had inflicted upon others the burden of an intolerable life, and thereby in so far had prolonged the sufferings of the universe.

On the other hand, Hartmann earnestly protests against following such advice, on the ground that it would only intensify the action of causes already at work by which the highest interests of civilization are imperiled. His philosophy, like that of Hegel, prides itself on the reconciliation of contradictory principles, and is probably indebted to this its Janus-faced aspect for much of its present popularity. Thus he is an optimist, because he holds, like Leibnitz, that this is the best possible universe ; but he is also a pessimist, on the ground that the best is bad enough, and the present universe is so bad that it would be far better if it did not exist at all. In every respect, non-being is preferable to being, for it is incapable of the suffering which is inseparable from the very nature of existence. The only question left concerns the proper choice of means for bringing the world to a speedy and effectual termination ; and Hartmann maintains that, far from checking the growth of the population, the best course is to increase and multiply as fast as

possible. In proportion as the human race becomes more numerous, the struggle for existence will be fiercer and more desperate, the misery so produced will be greater, and the combatants will be the sooner reconciled to the idea of giving up the fruitless contest altogether, and sinking back into the comparatively blissful repose of nothingness. Our duty, then, is not only to favor the growth of population, but in every way to promote the progress of enlightenment and the spread of civilization. Mankind must be educated up to pessimism ; all classes, all tribes and nations, must become convinced of the folly and misery of existence, before a concerted and vigorous effort can be made to get rid of the burden altogether. Meanwhile, not by a cowardly and selfish withdrawal from the conflict, as Schopenhauer and Mainländer recommend, leaving the ignorant multitude behind, deprived of their leaders and teachers, to multiply and suffer more than ever, but by entering heartily into the battle for life, bearing its sorrows and teaching others to bear them, may we hope to promote the final redemption of mankind from the woes which now afflict them.

Three illusions must be entirely overcome, according to Hartmann, before this consummation can be reached. The first consists in supposing that positive happiness is attainable by individuals in this life, at the present stage of development of the world's history ; and he argues at great length that this doctrine is confuted by experience. The second illusion is the belief that such happiness may be acquired hereafter, in a transcendent and immortal life beyond the grave ; and this belief is rejected, of course, as it conflicts at every point with the tenets of pessimism. The third stage of the illusion is that dream of the future perfectibility of the human race in which Condorcet and Godwin indulged, which is to be realized when the philosophical radicals shall have so far reformed all laws and political institutions as to establish upon this earth the perfect reign of liberty, equality, and fraternity ; to have finally dissipated this dream, as we have seen, is the glory of Malthusianism. Aid, then, in every way the advancement and diffusion of knowledge ; for "he that increases knowledge increases sorrow," and men will thus the sooner outgrow these three forms of illusion. Favor the increase of numbers also, as civilization will thus be more rapidly diffused over all lands, and the evils caused by over-population will tend more and more to convince mankind of the misery of existence and the expediency of bringing the universe to an end. Positive happiness is unattainable ; but negative happiness, the painlessness

of non-existence, is a goal within our reach. There will be at least a rest from sorrow in the grave of all things.

If the advice of Mainländer were followed, Hartmann argues, the only consequence would be to degrade and brutalize humanity, to give ignorance, feebleness, and stupidity the victory over intellect and character, and to make the world more populous than ever with a debased type of inhabitants. Unhappily, many causes are even now at work to bring about this very undesirable issue. The tendency, already noticed, of the educated classes to die out altogether, while those far below them in the scale are multiplying with ominous rapidity, is the plague-spot of our modern civilization. I have pointed out its deplorable results in the case of the Roman Empire ; and the speedy decline and corruption, after the age of Demosthenes, of Athenian culture and refinement, are probably attributable, in a considerable degree, to the action of the same cause. It is the inherent vice of an aristocracy of wealth and intellect, who are intent upon nothing so much as the adoption of any efficient means for preserving the superiority of their class above the vulgar. But it is a suicidal policy ; for, while it has a deceptive semblance of strengthening the position and influence of individual families, through preventing these advantages from being parceled out among too many heirs, it is destructive of the best interests of the class as a whole, and must soon lead to its entire extinction. Civilization can not be kept alive and transmitted undiminished to posterity, if the members of the educated classes think it a burden to have large families, and if even the women prefer to find some other vocation in life than that of bearing children and educating them. If a process of what the Darwinites would call "negative selection" is to go on, if only the creatures of a lower type are freely to propagate their kind, the average level of the species must be lowered, and a general deterioration of society is inevitable. Persons of wealth, culture, and refinement, instead of adopting the selfish policy of Mainländer, and taking care only for their personal redemption from the ills of life, should seek rather to transmit by inheritance their high qualities of mind and character to a future generation, and teach their children how to use these personal advantages in continuous efforts to promote the civilization and ennoble the type of humanity. If they do not fill the vacant places on the earth's surface, these will soon be occupied by the progeny of the ignorant and the debased, who in this respect are the dangerous classes of society.

FRANCIS BOWEN.